An Examination of Annual Athletic-fund Donor Motivations

Patrick Michael Gray

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise & Sport Science in Sport Administration

Chapel Hill
2009

Approved by:

Advisor: Dr. Richard Southall

Committee Member: Dr. Edgar Shields, Jr.

Committee Member: Ms. Amy Piland

ABSTRACT

Patrick M. Gray: An Examination of Annual Athletic-fund Donor Motivations

(Under the direction of Dr. Richard Southall)

The purpose of this study was to examine the motivating factors that contributed to annual contributions at three different NCAA institutions. Annual Fund donors at each participating school were contacted via e-mail and asked to take part in an online survey. Data was obtained from over 5,000 donors, including general demographic information as well as motivating factors that led to their annual contribution.

Using a Principle Component Analysis (PCA) motivating factors were grouped together and further analyzed to explore significant differences between the three institutions. Significant differences existed between all schools or two of the three schools when measured with each component. Motives deemed to be reciprocal were one of the components significantly different. The motives for giving were also measured between Alumni and Non-Alumni at each institution, with similar results.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER 1

The current college athletics landscape is one of growth. Escalating costs associated with scholarships and facilities have put a strain on many athletic departments. In fact, Brown (2007) indicated athletic spending is progressing three times faster than University spending. Escalating student-athlete scholarship and new facility costs, as well as coach's contracts have added to the strain. During the 2006 college football, 49 of the 119 Division 1-A coaches were making more than $1,000,000 (Greenburg, 2008). The desire to be "bigger and better" certainly demonstrates a need to generate revenue to offset associated costs.

In order to generate needed revenue, athletic departments look to several different avenues, including: ticket sales, sponsorships and student fees. Increasingly, charitable giving is a popular income source. In fact, according to Mahony (2003) 17% of total athletic department revenue is derived from alumni and private donor contributions. With the emphasis placed on soliciting donations from alumni and fans, studying the fundraising process is crucial.

Studies have attempted to link athletic success to results in fundraising efforts. However, very few studies go beyond a statistical analysis explore the donors themselves. In order to maximize fundraising efforts, the need to better understand donors and what explains their mindset when making a donation is imperative. Simply put, what is important to

someone who gives $100.00 annually may not be to someone that contributes $5000.00 annually.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine motives for giving to the annual athletic fund at three National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division-I institutions in the South-eastern United States.

Research Questions

The developed Research Questions were:

1) Are there significant differences in motives for giving between all three institutions?

2) Is there a significant difference between the motives for giving to the annual fund by alumni and non-alumni within each institution?

Definition of Terms

Annual Fund: donations contributed on an annual basis, generally used to pay for scholarships

Athletic Development: fundraising efforts that take place specifically for athletics

Development: an alternate term for fundraising

Donors: anyone that contributes to the fundraising efforts of the University

Pledge: a monetary commitment made to the fundraising efforts of a University

University Development: fundraising efforts specifically for academics.

Assumptions

1) Measures used to conduct this research were valid and reliable.

2) Data obtained through the responses of those surveyed were recorded in an accurate and timely manner.

3) The subjects responded in an honest manner.

4) The results gathered were drawn from a large enough sample to generalize the motives for giving to the annual fund at NCAA Division 1 institutions.

Limitations

1) The study was limited to those subjects who voluntarily participated.

2) All subjects surveyed contribute to the annual fund of one of the three institutions selected.

3) Due to the study's time and scope, the survey was only sent to donors with a valid e-mail address.

4) Respondents may not be representative of all similar institutions.

5) The respondents may not be truthful in their responses, especially concerning their total annual donation.

6) Some motives may vary based on giving levels, so no all benefits associated with each level may apply to all respondents.

Delimitations

The study only included subjects who donate to three selected institutions annual funds. Likewise, only those that have a valid e-mail address registered with each institution was contacted for participation in the study.

Significance of Study

This study is significant to several constituents. The following is a breakdown for whom this study is significant:

Significance to industry professionals

While there are several revenue sources, such as: (ticket sales, licensed merchandise and television contracts) the need to find additional sources is crucial. The main goal for most athletic development offices is to help offset the costs of student-athlete scholarships. The focus of this research is the annual fund, which at most institutions is directly responsible for covering such scholarship costs. Having information, but more importantly an instrument to measure donor motives could enable athletic departments to better understand their donor base.

Significance to researchers

The ability to better understand athletic department annual fund donor motivations is an area that can assist in other areas of research. Results from this study might provide value for not only athletic departments, but also institutional advancement efforts and those that study the area of philanthropy as a whole.

Significance to athletic-department administrators

The institutions that participated in this directly benefit from this study. The first part of the survey distributed to donors provides the athletic department with valuable demographic information, including donors' annual income that assists departmental fund raisers in approaching donors from each level. Secondly, understanding donor motives enables an athletic development office to tailor their offerings to maximize generated donations and in turn provide more student-athlete opportunities.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Research pertaining to athletic development has increased as the need to increase revenues for the athletic department has risen. The first section within this review will document research exploring winning, or athletic success and donations. The second section details research of donor behavior and motivations towards contributions to athletic development.

Athletic Success Affecting Donations

A common term when discussing the relationship athletic success has on an institution is the "Flutie effect" or "Flutie factor." Johnson (2006) summarizes the Flutie effect as the impact of sudden athletic success on a college or university's fiscal well-being, the number and quality of admissions and amount of donations. There has been a wealth of research conducted recently to measure just this concept, four studies in particular look specifically on the effect winning has on athletic donations (Daughtrey, 2000; Stinson & Howard, 2004 & 2007; Covell, 2005; Humphreys & Mondello, 2007. These particular studies examine donor behavior and motivations to give, related to one variable; winning.

Daughtrey (2000) studied the affect winning a championship has on donations at Division I-AA, II and III levels. Daughtrey's measure of athletic success was of championships won and he examined the following four areas: a) voluntary support to the

university, b) number of donors to the university, c) voluntary support to the athletic department, and d) number of donors to the athletic department.

Results were translated into percentage of change to reflect the different sizes and divisions of the institutions researched. The impact of winning a championship certainly resulted in an increased donor base. In I-AA the amount of donors who gave to athletics increased by 34.21% the year after winning a championship, this figure was much higher in D-II which experienced a 51.31% increase (Daughtrey). Both levels experienced a growth in the number of donors during the championship season. Although the level of competition and financial figures discussed are not comparable to Division I-A, the concept that people want to give to winning programs is something that can be used to explain the importance of each donation. Cialdini (1976) explained this phenomenon as donors wanting to bask in the winning team's reflected glory and being part of something memorable.

Daughtery (2000) concluded athletic departments should take advantage of winning a championship and capitalize on the pride and good feelings that alumni have towards an institution after a memorable championship season. One other relevant finding was in D-II & D-III on average the number of donors and total university donations decreased during and after a championship season. Daughtrey speculated that perhaps donors at these divisions might feel if they have enough money to win football championships the school doesn't need their money.

Stinson and Howard (2004) explored the affect winning has on an institution in a major D-IA athletics conference. By examining both athletic and academic fundraising, Stinson and Howard hoped to determine three alumni and non-alumni donor intention

categories. First, they hoped to determine to what degree alumni do and non-alumni contribute to academic and/or athletic programs at higher-education institutions. Secondly, Stinson & Howard wanted to examine if improved performance of high-profile sports effects on contributions to athletics or academics. Finally, they wished to discover what impact does alumni and non-alumni contributions to athletics have on giving to educational programs?

The study looked at all donors (N=2309) who gave a gift of $1000 or more to the University of Oregon between 1994 and 2002. The gifts were coded as being from an alumnus or non-alumnus and then further categorized into three giving areas: (a) athletic gifts, (b) academic gifts and (c) other gifts (i.e. university art museum or theatre). (Howard & Stinson, 2004) Not only was 1994 the first year reliable data was kept, it coincided with the beginning of a great run of success for Oregon's football team and basketball teams. As a result it was felt this time period was a true test of whether athletic success had an effect on athletics (Stinson & Howard).

The first answered question was who donates to the educational institution and whether those donations were to athletics or academics. The results indicated that in all but two years, alumni made higher gifts to academics than non-alumni (Stinson & Howard, 2004). However, in every year of the study non-alumni contributed more to athletics than academics. The second question was whether athletic success had an effect on contributions to athletics and academics. Results showed that the percentage of donors indicating that a portion of their gift went to athletics steadily increased to a high of 69.5% in 2002 (Stinson & Howard). Significantly, during the study's time period average donations to athletics increased by more than $700.00, during the same period the amount of donors making academic donations decreased (Stinson & Howard). Therefore athletics success had a neutral

to negative influence on alumni academic giving. The third question was whether contributions to athletics had an effect on contributions to academics by alumni and non-alumni. Results indicated that over the study's time period average giving to academics decreased, while the average gift to athletics increased. In addition, both alumni and non-alumni directed their gifts to athletics (Stinson & Howard). These conclusions supported previous research that suggested giving to athletics undermines academic giving. (Sperber, 2000)

Several important implications and critical conclusions can be drawn from Stinson and Howard's (2004) study. While further examination of donor motivations and institution "cultivation strategies" is needed to better understand institutional fundraising, the idea that donor behaviour is driven by tangible benefits is an important finding. Donors who give $1000 to athletics are given preferential tickets and parking as well as invitations to social events, whereas the same donation to academics results in a membership to the President's Club with no other tangible benefits (Stinson & Howard). Such tangible benefits may explain the gradual decline in gifts to academic programs. Aware that since their research was specific to the University of Oregon, it would be difficult to generalize it is difficult to generalize their findings, Stinson and Howard theorized the existence of similar trends at other Division I-A institutions and called for further examination to confirm or deny such contentions. Finally, the researchers recognized the study's limitations, concluding it was not a true barometer of donor motivations and the giving-decision process.

Covell (2005) took a different approach to exploring the concept of winning on donations, using stakeholder theory to assess the impact of winning on athletic donations within a conference, specifically the Ivy League. Since they were an accessible sample, Ivy-

League football season-ticket-holders' giving trends were surveyed to measure the exhibited loyalty of various stakeholders associated each school (Covell, 2005). Theorizing colleges and universities use athletics to foster a sense of community among students, alumni, and the general public, Covell concluded any correlation between winning and giving can only be accurately measured on an institution-by-institution basis.

Covell's (2005) sample had attended the institutions as undergraduates and 45% were former student-athletes. In addition, of those surveyed (N = 273), 141 (52%) had given to the athletic department within the last year and the average number of years respondents had been donating was 15 years (Covell, 2005). The mean length of continued giving indicated winning and giving were not closely related for the group surveyed. Consistent with stakeholder theory, a significant finding was donors who had been giving for longer than 25 years were less likely to have their donations impacted by winning, whereas those who had been donating for fewer years were more likely to be impacted negatively by short-term team results.

Humphreys and Mondello (2007) examined if success affected donations over a twenty year period. The study focused on donations to Division-I institutions that sponsored intercollegiate basketball and football for at least one season between the years1976-1996. The sample consisted of 320 institutions and 6400 institutional years. Humphreys and Mondello took a different approach than most similar studies in measuring athletic success, using the following variables to explore the affect athletic success has on donations: (a) total educational and general expenditure and revenues, (b) enrollment and (c) other institutional characteristics. Historically athletic success had been measured by appearances in bowl games and the NCAA Division-I Men's basketball tournament. According to Humphreys &

Mondello 13% of public institutions appeared in bowl games between 1976-1996 and 18% appeared in the D-I NCAA men's basketball tournament. These figures were much smaller for private institutions as only 5% had appeared in bowl games and 15% in the NCAA tournament (Humphreys & Mondello). Taking this into account, the researchers collected data on appearances in the final Top 20 or Top 25 polls in both sports. To avoid any confusion the national champion in football was defined as the team or teams that finished ranked number one in the final polls.

Interestingly, appearing in a bowl game and the postseason basketball tournament in the previous season had no effect on unrestricted donations to public institutions. However, both measures of success were correlated with increases in restricted donations - defined as those funds given directly to the athletic department, versus unrestricted donations given to the institutions general fund. However, the research was not without its flaws, as the authors outlined the impact of bowl appearance on percentage increase in restricted donations a dichotomous variable. The example used was Colorado State, whose average annual restricted donation total of $9,250,459 was increased only 13% increase by its appearance in a bowl game and receiving a $1.2 million payout, whereas Arkansas State's appearance in the same bowl game disproportionately increased its restricted donation percentage, since its average annual restricted donation total was only $555,795.

Humphrey & Mondello's (2007) data was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) finance survey. The in-depth nature of the data and the long data collection time frame allowed the researchers to examine the effect of athletic success on restricted and unrestricted donations at public and private institutions. The questions of why donors would support a successful athletic program

but not an unsuccessful athletic program are asked. Stinson and Howard's (2004) study suggests a theory of success increasing donations because of a tangible exchange. In other words, with athletic success an increase in demand for tickets is evident and fans must contribute to secure good seats. The need for additional research on specific motivating factors for donors is suggested by Humphrey & Mondello.

Stinson and Howard (2007) continued to further explore the impact athletic success has on giving, by studying the impact on academic and athletic giving. The study examined three possible characteristics to assist in determining the impact performance has on giving: (a) alumni status of the donor, (b) the type of gift made and, (c) the academic reputation of the institution (Stinson & Howard).

In order to measure the impact of giving, Stinson and Howard analyzed giving records collected by the Council for Aid to Education. This data was matched with measures of institutional academic prestige and athletic success. The researchers measured academic prestige by utilizing the U.S. News and World Report rankings. Whereas, athletic success was measured using variables that included: football record, football bowl appearances, football bowl wins and football tradition.

One of the research questions Stinson and Howard (2007) explored was the extent to which on-field performance influences charitable giving by alumni and non-alumni. Although this study focused on success affecting donations, which is not directly related to the present study, there are some important findings relating to giving patterns between alumni and non-alumni. Stinson & Howard found that, in general, alumni donate more total dollars then non-alumni. This particular finding is misleading as there were more alumni

making contributions than non-alumni. The most significant finding was that the average gift made by non-alumni ($605.00) was much higher than the average gift made by alumni ($365.00) (Stinson & Howard). Both results will provide a measurement when exploring the second research question, as average gifts for alumni and non-alumni will be calculated, as well as the alumni/non-alumni status of donors at each of the institution.

Examining Donor Motivations

The studies conducted by Daughtrey (2000), Stinson & Howard (2004 & 2007), Covell (2005) and Humphreys & Mondello (2007) all suggest there is a need to further explore what motivates donors to give. Several studies further explore donor behavior itself, as opposed to a dependent variable like winning. Staurowsky (1996), Mahony, Gladden & Funk (2003), Wells, Southall, Stotlar & Mundfrom (2005), and Mann (2007) all attempted to theorize why contributions are made.

Staurowsky (1996) conducted research that helped better understand donor behavior and motivation. The purpose of the study was to develop an instrument to measure motivation and test a proposed theoretical model. The instrument used in this study was "ACQUIRE-II" which is a three-part, 43-item self-report survey. The instrument was devised from previous research and was sent to 100 donors at two different Division 1 institutions, as well as two different Division III institutions for the purpose of conducting a pilot study. As stated by the researcher, the purpose of the study was to develop an instrument; therefore only results pertaining to construction, validity and reliability of the donor motivation section of the survey were discussed.

Results from this study are pertinent as it helps gain a better understanding of what motivates donors to contribute and most importantly provides an early theoretical framework, from which to build upon. Once the completed surveys were returned the researcher conducted an exploratory principal component analysis (PCA) with the donor motivations portion of the survey. This analysis demonstrated 70% of donor motivations for giving could be explained by six factors: benefits, philanthropic, power, social, success 1, and success 2. The six factors comprised the survey instrument and suggested donor motivations can be measured with a great deal of confidence using Acquire-II.

Mahony, Gladden & Funk (2003) used Staurowsky's (1996) work to develop a scale with 33 items and 10 factors to further explore this area, as well as assess the importance of motives and examine the utility to predict donor behavior and differences between individual institutions. Using the previously-tested ACQUIRE-II instrument Mahony (2003) made some modifications and examined 12 factors: (a) philanthropic, (b) social, (c) escape, (d) priority seating for football, (e) priority seating for basketball, (f) business enhancement, (g) success – tradition, (h) success – current, (i) success – future, (j) success – community pride, (k) nostalgia and, (l) psychological commitment. It should be noted that benefits were broken down by football and basketball, as it was felt motivations may be different at schools where football is the primary sport and vice versa.

One of this study's goals was to examine institutional differences, thus a survey was sent to three different Division I-A institutions. Selecting three institutions satisfied the need to explore differences, and provided the researchers with a large amount of data. Institutions were selected based on geographic location in the country and in proximity to a city, as well as the primary sport used to generate revenue and by conference affiliation. A total of 1780

surveys were returned by donors at all three of the institutions. School A's response rate was 19%, with 935 returned surveys. School B had a response rate of 41% (N = 405), while School C had a response rate of 45% (N = 441 surveys).

Mahony et al's (2003) results provide a benchmark for measuring the demographic profile of different institutions. For example, the average age of School A respondents was 56.5 years and 69.1% of respondents had an annual income of over $70,000 (Mahony). School B produced similar demographic information; the average age of this group was 51.76 and 68.9% made over $70,000. School C produced an average age of 55 and 85% made over $70,000 (Mahony).

While this study also had limitations, it produced a useful scale for measuring donor motivations and provided a starting point for future research. In addition the researchers were able to determine the relative importance of various motives: notably priority seating, improving revenue-sport (football and men's basketball) programs (Mahony et al, 2003). However, being able to predict donor behavior was not satisfied, as the scale used did not predict a sufficient amount of variance in money donated. It was suggested further research be conducted to see if other factors would be better to predict, donor motivation. Finally, it was determined donors at different institutions are unique and that each institution must understand its donors before developing fundraising plans.

Staurowsky (1996) and Mahony (2003) both conducted studies examining donor behaviour, whereas Wells, Southall, Stotlar & Mundrom (2005) conducted a study to develop an equation for estimating an annual fundraising goal. The research used 15 predictor variables selected from previous research to develop a survey instrument, which collected

data on annual fundraising contributions from a sample of Directors of Development for each NCAA institution that participated in Division I-A football.

As previously stated Wells et al. selected 15 predictor variables to answer their research questions. These factors were analyzed using the selected criterion variable (monetary contribution) during the 2000 fiscal year. The predictor variables were described as follows:

> The predictor variables were selected after a review of literature and were divided into four categories. The first category of predictor variables were identified as *institutional characteristics*. Institutional characteristics included the institution's total number of living alumni and the type of institution (public or private). The second category of predictor variables were identified as *demographic characteristics.* Demographic characteristics included state population, state median per capita personal income, and the number of schools that participated in college athletics in the state. The third category was defined as *organizational fund-raising characteristics* and included the following variables: (1) total number of years the institution had designated a full-time fundraising position; (2) continuous number of years the institution had conducted an annual fundraising program; (3) the Director of Development's total number of years' experience in the field of fundraising; (4) the total number of part-time paid staff members that working on the athletic department's annual fundraising program; (5) the size of the athletic department's prospective donor list; (6) the total number of volunteers utilized during the athletic department's annual fundraising program. The fourth category included predictor variables associated with *institutional athletic success characteristics*. These

variables included the following: (1) accumulated percentage of stadium capacity for football attendance; (2) season football ticket sales; (3) previous year football win/loss percentage; and (4) appearance in a bowl game at the end of 1999-2000 football season (p, 6-7).

The variable most highly correlated with annual contributions was football season-ticket sales. This was logical as most institutions implement priority seating, where preferred seating is given to donors who contribute more. The other variables highly correlated with contributions were deemed to be: (a) number of living alumni, (b) accumulated season football attendance and, (c) appearance in a bowl game (Wells et al., 2005). A finding that came from this study that had not been demonstrated in other literature was that the Director of Development's years of experience had a positive effect on annual fundraising.

There were a number of interesting conclusions drawn from this particular study. For example football win/loss percentage was not found to be significant as it explained very little in the annual contributions. However, there was a significant positive relationship between a bowl-game appearance and annual contributions. This study provided further evidence of factors that contribute to donations to an institution's annual fund and most importantly a statistical benchmark for individual factors.

Theoretical Research in Fundraising

In order to provide a solid framework from which to explain obtained results, several theories pertaining to fundraising were examined. Mann (2007) outlined several fundraising theories in order to provide industry professionals with a better understanding of college donors.

The first theory introduced is *charitable giving theory* (Mann, 2007). This theory states there are generally three motivations to explain why people make donations:

(1) altruism, (2) reciprocity, and (3) direct benefits. It is suggested alumni feel obligated to give back to their alma mater and do so because they have "pride" in the institution. The mindset of such a donor is they have a responsibility to make a contribution.

A second theory discussed is *organizational identification theory* (Mann, 2007). This theory is based on the idea that people who define or identify themselves by their association with an organization, have a strong connection to a particular organization and, therefore, celebrate the successes of the particular organization (Mann, 2007). In a college fundraising setting this theory would be realized by donors celebrating the achievement of fundraising goals and the thought of meeting such goals motivates them to donate.

The third theory is *social identification theory*, which suggests people are influenced by how they order themselves into social groups. It is theorized that people develop a deep psychological connection to that particular group. In a college setting this might be realized by donors giving to a particular cause. Perhaps someone that played a particular sport would like to see the sport succeed and contributes to that specific cause.

Mann's (2007) *economic theory* contends donors are motivated to give a gift that benefits someone else, especially when there is an evident need. In addition, donors better understand the need or value for a gift if they have previously been the recipient of such a worthy gift. This theory is applicable in examining gifts to a student provided through an athletic or academic scholarship.

Services-philanthropic theory suggests people's giving intent is influenced by three constructs: (1) service value, (2) service quality and (3) satisfaction. This theory looks at the idea that when donors have a positive experience and perceive their alma mater in a positive manner, they are more likely to be receptive to its fundraising needs.

The final theory explored was the *relationship-marketing theory.* This theory examines the different relationships a customer has with an organization. The relationship might be *transactional* or *relational*, the first being a relationship where something is exchanged with no emotional attachment, the second being a relationship based upon strong emotional connection. In a college fundraising setting, the theory is related to the communication an institution has with its donors. An effective, positive message will shape a positive relationship with the donor, whereas poor communication will suggest a much more transactional relationship. It is theorized creating a more emotional connection may support overall fundraising efforts.

Since donors might be motivated by one or more of the presented theories, determining which motives are significant will assist in constructing an overall development plan. However, many fundraising strategies have no theoretical basis. Such an approach may be the result of frequent turnover or simply narrowly focused campaign goals. However, Mann (2007) contended a better understanding of donor motivation theories will allow fundraisers to better determine donor motivations.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Theoretical Considerations

As previously stated, charitable giving theory identifies a donor's first motive for giving as altruism. Mann (2007) defines altruism as a donor's sense of obligation that is strengthened by strong feelings of allegiance and empathy towards a college. The second research question associated with this study is whether motives vary between alumni and non-alumni. Specifically do non-alumni donors have the same sense of allegiance towards a college as do alumni donors? Two scale items will be used to examine whether donors contribute for truly altruistic reasons. The first item that will help establish whether donors give for altruistic reasons is the question that asks donors to rank the importance of having the ability "to provide educational opportunities for student-athletes."

This question measures altruistic intention, since the donor receives nothing in return, other than a positive feeling of knowing an athlete is obtaining an education. Another question intended to measure altruistic motives is the opportunity "to repay past benefits I have received from sports in general." This question measures altruistic intention as well, since nothing is expected in return other than a feeling of paying back for past successes or good sentiments associated with sport.

The second motive Mann (2007) discussed is the concept of reciprocity. Mann based this motive on the notion that contributions are made on expectation of a potential benefit. It is noted that it is difficult to establish a universal benefit, associated with giving in a college environment; however there are several motivating factors in this study that fit the definition of a reciprocal benefit. The concept of improving the athletic program - or specific areas of the program, such as football, men's basketball, women's basketball or Olympic sports - is an example of reciprocity. Donors contribute in the hope that for their largess they will receive the benefits of a successful program. Likewise, contributing to promote the image of the institution and/or a particular coach or administrator, assists in the desire of a receiving a winning or successful athletics program in return.

The third and final motive Mann (2007) listed as a motivating factor for giving was direct benefits, which differs from reciprocity in that there are generally established tangible benefits expected, as opposed to a general hope or desire to improve athletics. Direct benefits measured in this study include: (a) the ability to gain a tax deduction, (b) receive athletic publications, (c) priority parking for athletic events, (d) invitations to special events and, (e) institution-specific branded items. All of the aforementioned items provide the donor with tangible benefits. In addition, similar to Mahony's (2003) study that separated priority seating for football and basketball from other benefits these two specific direct benefits were separated in this study, in order to measure the motives independent from other benefits.

While Mann's (2007) theoretical framework allows for classification of motives, for the purposes of this study a fourth possible donor motivation was theorized. Cialdini (2006) discussed the concept of "social proof," which he defined as: "One means we use to determine what is correct is to find out what other people think is correct...we view a

behavior as more correct in a given situation to the degree that we see others performing it" (p.116). In the context of this study there are several developed motives that support the concept of social proofing. Social proofing motives include: (a) being a member of the fundraising entity of the institution, (b) joining friends and colleagues in supporting athletics, (c) continuing a family tradition and, (d) enhancing business opportunities. All four motives suggest donors engage in a behavior because others engage in similar behavior, or because the behavior is deemed to be socially preferred or acceptable (Cialdini, 2006).

Using Mann's (2007) three motive classifications, and Cialdini's concept of social proofing, a solid theoretical framework has been established. Utilizing the developed framework, the conducted survey attempted to answer whether there are significant differences in motives between the donors from the institutions participating in the study.

Subjects

The population (N = 119) considered for this study is all NCAA Division I-A institutions. This study's sample consisted of three NCAA D-IA institutions were selected. In addition to being an accessible sample, all three institutions have similarities, but also distinct differences, as the following profile will suggest

Table 1. School Profiles

Institution	**Area of Country**	**School Location**	**Primary Sport**	**Enrollment (approx)**
School A (Public)	Southeast	Small College Town	Basketball	28,000
School B (Public)	Southeast	Urban	Football	31,000
School C (Private)	Southeast	Urban	Basketball	13,000

The sample for this research study can be further defined as anyone at the defined institutions who contributed to the annual fund in 2008 and have a working e-mail address. The number of subjects at each institution varied, since each university had a different number of contributors to their respective annual funds. The population for each institution was as follows: School A: (n = 9914), School B: (n=15918) and School C: (n=7593). These figures are based on the number of donor e-mail addresses on file. In order to determine how many respondents would be appropriate for each institution the study by Mahony (2003) was referenced. In his study the average number of respondents between the three institutions was 35%. Using this figure as a benchmark, the same response rate will be sought for those donors that have a working e-mail address.

Variables

The study's variables were as follows:

Independent: donors who contributed to the annual fund and each institution

Dependent: the twenty-one motives determined as reasons for giving to the annual fund

Instrumentation

In order to understand the motivating factors related to donors giving to the annual fund at different institutions, a survey instrument was developed based upon the ACQUIRE-II survey instrument devised by Ellen Staurowsky (1996) and the revised instrument constructed by Mahony, Gladden & Funk (2003). Both instruments were modified to reflect this study's institutions. Several questions were removed as they were deemed to be irrelevant to the study based on the research questions. In addition, each institution

participating in the study had an opportunity to review the survey to exclude any questions they did not wish to be asked of their donors.

The first part of the survey asked donors for basic information about themselves and their annual contributions. The second part of the survey was a series of 21 potential motives for giving. Subjects were asked to rate the importance of each motive on their ultimate contribution to the annual fund. Importance was measured on a 5-point *Likert* scale, with each point having an assumed equal value in order to obtain interval data. The 5 points were defined as: (1) unimportant, (2) of little importance, (3) moderately important, (4) important and (5) very important.

Procedures for Data Collection

In an attempt to assist in administering the survey a contact at each institution was established. This individual served as a liaison between researcher and institution donors. The role of the liaison was minimal; however they did assist in compiling a list of donors that have a working e-mail address and contribute to the institutions athletic annual fund.

Once a list of donors with a working e-mail address was established for each institution, a link was sent by the liaison to each donor. This link took the subjects directly to a survey specific to the university's annual fund. The donors were asked to answer a series of questions beginning with general demographic information, followed by Likert scale questions to determine which motives explained giving. The link remained open for ten days at which time the donors were sent a reminder e-mail, informing them that they had another week in which to respond to the survey. After the seventeen-day period, the link became inactive and the results were analyzed.

Statistical Analysis

Once the data were collected, a series of descriptive statistics were calculated. For each of the institutions surveyed totals were tabulated for each demographic question (Questions 1-3). In addition, percentages were calculated for age and alumni status. Also, the mean amount of total money donated was calculated for each institution, as well as alumni/non-alumni within each institution.

For the purpose of analyzing the data derived from the Likert scale questions each of the motives for giving were divided into like-groups. Groupings were based on the three motives for giving outlined by Mann, as well as the social proofing category. The created groups produced a mean used to further analyze the data. Table 2 highlights the defined motive groupings.

In addition to the groupings established from theoretical considerations, a *Principal Component Analysis* (PCA) was conducted to identify data patterns, and highlight similarities and differences (Smith, 2002). Once the groupings were formed, frequencies and mean scores were tabulated for each grouping in order to run further statistical procedures.

The first research question was whether there is a difference in motives for giving between institutions. In an attempt to further explore this question a one-way between subjects *Analysis of Variance* (ANOVA) was conducted comparing each of the institutions with one another utilizing the five different components. Although, School A and B are very similar an ANOVA was used to help determine if there was a significant difference in motives for giving. Likewise, both institutions were compared with a private institution;

School C. In order to further explore possible differences a *Tukey post-hoc test* was used to "dig deeper" into any significant findings that might exist following the ANOVA test.

Table 2. Theoretical Motive Groupings

Motive Grouping	Motive
Altruistic Motives	To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes
	To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general
Reciprocal Motives	To promote the image of the institution
	To improve the quality of the athletic program
	To improve the quality of the football program
	To improve the quality of the men's basketball program
	To improve the quality of the women's basketball program
	To improve the quality of the Olympic Sports programs
	To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator
Social Proofing Motives	To be a member of the fundraising entity of the institution
	To join with friends and colleagues in supporting athletics
	To continue a family tradition
	To enhance my business opportunities
	To continue my affiliation with the institution
Direct Benefits	To gain a tax deduction
	To receive athletic publications – media guides, magazines
	To receive priority parking for athletic events
	To receive invitations to special events
	To receive branded items – lapel pin, auto decals, etc.
Direct Benefits – Priority Seating	To obtain priority seating for football
	To obtain priority seating for basketball

The second research question asked whether there was a significant difference in motives for giving between alumni and non-alumni. In order to answer this question, an independent sample T-test was conducted to explore whether there was a difference between alumni and non-alumni at each institution. The mean scores for both alumni and non-alumni were compared with each of the five components.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The Donor Motivation Questionnaire was sent via e-mail to each institution. The survey was sent to 9,914 donors at School A, 15,918 at School B and 7,593 at School C. Each institution has a larger membership base, however only those members with an e-mail address registered with the fundraising entity were contacted. Table 3 outlines the survey response rate at each institution:

Table 3. Survey Response Rate

School	Response Rate	Totally Completed Survey's
A	1960 (19.8%)	1853
B	2335 (14.6%)	2153
C	1473 (19.2%)	1473

There were several demographic questions, including: age, alumni status and total 2008 contribution. The first question asked was the age of each respondent. Donors were asked to select the range that contained their age. The most prominent age group at School A was 56-65, which equated to 24.7% of all responses or 481 donors in total. The most prominent age group at School C was also 56-65, equating to 24.5% of respondents or 352 donors in total. School B yielded considerably different results, the most prominent age

group was 26-35, consisting of 24.0% of all respondents, 559 respondents in total. Table 1 illustrates the age breakdown of the respondents at each of the institutions that participated in the study.

Table 4. Age Breakdown

	School A	School B	School C
Under 25	2.7% (52)	8.7% (202)	5.5% (80)
26-35	17.3% (337)	**24.0% (559)**	11.0% (161)
36-45	19.0% (370)	22.5% (524)	15.1% (221)
46-55	22.8% (445)	20.9% (487)	23.5% (344)
56-65	**24.7% (481)**	16.7% (388)	**24.5% (359)**
66-75	10.5% (205)	6.0% (139)	13.9% (203)
Over 75	3.1% (60)	1.3% (31)	6.6% (96)

One area of interest in this study was comparing motivations of alumni and non-alumni. Therefore respondents' university affiliation was determined. School B had the largest percentage of alumni contributors in its sample. Of the 2319 donors who responded to the question, 76.4% (1772) were alumni. Conversely, School C had the lowest rate of alumni respondents, 67.5% of those that responded were alumni. Table 5 summarizes each institution's respondent's statuses:

Table 5. Alumni Status

	Alumni	Non-Alumni
School A	72.2% (1405)	27.8% (541)
School B	76.4% (1772)	23.6% (547)
School C	67.5% (989)	32.5% (476)

Donors were asked to record their 2008 annual fund contribution. The survey asked for exact contribution amounts, versus a giving range to better determine a mean contribution. Table 6 demonstrates the mean contribution for each institution, as well as the mean contribution for both alumni and non-alumni at each participating school.

Table 6. Contributions

	Mean Contribution	Mean Alumni	Mean Non-Alumni
School A	$941.36	$905.16	$1035.35
School B	$1148.45	$1015.71	$1600.39
School C	$2625.56	$2705.94	$2456.52

Research Question #1

- Are there significant differences in motives for giving between all three institutions?

The respondents at each of the institutions were asked to rate the importance twenty-one different motives had on their most recent contribution to the annual fund. The Likert scale utilized ranged from 1 (unimportant) to 5 (very important).

At School A the most important motive, based on the highest rated score in the "very important" category, was "providing educational opportunities to student-athletes." (mean = 4.20) The motive that was least important, based on the highest rated score in the "unimportant" category was "enhancing business opportunities." (mean = 1.56) Table 7 illustrates the breakdown of responses to motives at School A.

Table 7. School A Motives Breakdown

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	2.5% (46)	7.1% (133)	21.8% (407)	42.7% (798)	26.0% (486)
To obtain priority seating for football	10.2% (191)	13.0% (244)	15.2% (285)	27.4% (512)	34.1% (638)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	20.7% (380)	19.5% (358)	14.7% (271)	19.3% (356)	25.8% (475)
To promote the image of the University	2.0% (37)	4.1% (76)	18.7% (349)	39.3% (735)	36.0% (672)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	0.7% (14)	2.8% (52)	15.3% (286)	38.5% (721)	**42.7% (800)**
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	0.6% (12)	2.0% (38)	13.4% (251)	41.6% (778)	42.3% (791)
To improve the quality of the football program	2.0% (38)	4.9% (91)	18.4% (344)	37.7% (704)	36.9% (688)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	2.3% (43)	5.3% (99)	19.9% (370)	38.8% (721)	33.6% (625)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	6.6% (123)	12.6% (234)	28.8% (535)	31.7% (589)	20.3% (378)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	6.1% (114)	13.4% (249)	31.0% (576)	31.5% (586)	17.9% (333)
To gain a tax deduction	19.9% (372)	29.9% (559)	27.0% (505)	16.3% (306)	6.9% (130)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	36.6% (679)	27.3% (506)	18.6% (345)	12.2% (226)	5.3% (99)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	8.8% (164)	12.3% (231)	28.7% (537)	33.6% (628)	16.6% (311)
To continue a family tradition	50.3% (931)	18.4% (341)	11.5% (213)	12.4% (230)	7.3% (136)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	37.6% (698)	24.2% (449)	19.8% (368)	12.2% (227)	6.0% (112)
To enhance my business opportunities	**62.0% (1143)**	25.2% (465)	8.6% (159)	3.2% (59)	0.9% (17)
To continue my affiliation with the University	5.9% (109)	4.3% (80)	18.9% (352)	36.7% (683)	34.3% (639)
To receive athletic publications	7.1% (133)	14.3% (267)	33.5% (625)	31.6% (590)	13.4% (250)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	23.0% (428)	18.5% (344)	21.2% (393)	20.0% (371)	17.3% (322)
To receive invitations to special events	14.0% (257)	18.7% (344)	31.4% (577)	25.1% (462)	10.7% (197)
To receive XXXX-branded items	19.1% (355)	25.7% (478)	28.0% (521)	19.1% (356)	8.2% (152)

At School B, the most important motive based on the highest number of respondents in the "very important" category was "improving the quality of the football program." (mean =- 4.31) The least important motive based on the highest number of respondents in the "unimportant" category was "enhancing business opportunities." (mean = 1.67) Table 8 provides a breakdown of responses to the importance of each motive at School B. At School C the most important motive based on the highest number of respondents in the "very important" category was "providing educational opportunities to student-athletes." (mean = 4.30) The motive least important based on the most responses in the "unimportant" section was "enhancing business opportunities" (mean = 1.61) Table 9 outlines the frequencies of the importance of each motive at School C.

Table 8. School B Motives Breakdown

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	3.1% (68)	7.1% (153)	23.2% (503)	38.8% (839)	27.8% (601)
To obtain priority seating for football	9.1% (195)	9.6% (206)	11.2% (241)	24.2% (520)	46.0% (988)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	28.8% (609)	24.7% (522)	17.0% (359)	15.0% (318)	14.6% (308)
To promote the image of the University	2.4% (52)	4.1% (90)	19.5% (424)	38.2% (829)	35.7% (775)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	2.7% (58)	6.0% (159)	23.1% (501)	38.0% (823)	30.3% (656)
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	1.3% (29)	1.9% (41)	12.6% (273)	34.3% (742)	49.9% (1081)
To improve the quality of the football program	1.6% (34)	2.4% (52)	10.5% (228)	34.4% (744)	**51.1% (1107)**
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	4.8% (104)	6.2% (134)	16.5% (357)	31.7% (687)	40.8% (882)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	10.6% (228)	14.2% (306)	29.2% (629)	27.7% (597)	18.4% (397)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	13.2% (286)	20.4% (441)	30.6% (662)	23.1% (499)	12.7% (274)
To gain a tax deduction	18.5% (397)	30.1% (644)	26.8% (573)	17.3% (370)	7.4% (158)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	36.6% (787)	30.4% (654)	19.0% (409)	9.6% (207)	4.4% (95)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	7.2% (155)	11.8% (255)	24.5% (529)	35.7% (772)	20.9% (452)
To continue a family tradition	40.4% (871)	19.3% (417)	15.0% (323)	14.4% (311)	10.9% (235)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	33.8% (731)	25.0% (541)	21.9% (473)	12.3% (265)	7.0% (151)
To enhance my business opportunities	**56.5% (1219)**	26.9% (581)	11.2% (242)	4.1% (88)	1.3% (27)
To continue my affiliation with the University	5.4% (116)	6.0% (129)	22.7% (491)	36.1% (781)	29.8% (644)
To receive athletic publications	13.2% (285)	20.9% (452)	34.8% (753)	23.4% (505)	7.7% (167)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	13.8% (299)	12.0% (260)	17.6% (381)	30.2% (653)	26.3% (567)
To receive invitations to special events	18.4% (396)	26.1% (563)	29.8% (644)	19.3% (417)	6.4% (138)
To receive XXXX-branded items	22.7% (493)	30.6% (663)	26.3% (570)	14.6% (317)	5.8% (125)

Table 9. School C Motives Breakdown

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	19.4% (256)	25.8% (340)	28.8% (379)	17.7% (233)	8.3% (110)
To obtain priority seating for football	50.7% (664)	19.9% (260)	14.6% (191)	9.4% (123)	5.4% (71)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	29.4% (392)	12.8% (171)	14.9% (199)	16.6% (221)	26.3% (351)
To promote the image of the University	5.4% (71)	8.3% (110)	23.5% (312)	37.5% (497)	25.3% (335)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	1.9% (25)	2.5% (33)	14.7% (196)	34.5% (460)	**46.5% (621)**
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	1.4% (19)	2.3% (30)	14.3% (90)	40.3% (537)	41.8% (557)
To improve the quality of the football program	6.2% (80)	10.4% (134)	23.4% (303)	31.6% (409)	28.4% (367)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	4.9% (65)	6.5% (87)	19.6% (262)	36.2% (484)	32.8% (438)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	8.2% (108)	13.2% (173)	28.9% (380)	31.7% (416)	18.0% (238)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	12.9% (172)	23.4% (312)	29.6% (395)	22.3% (298)	11.9% (159)
To gain a tax deduction	31.3% (402)	27.1% (348)	26.6% (341)	10.8% (139)	4.1% (53)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	24.9% (328)	17.5% (230)	20.2% (266)	19.1% (252)	18.4% (242)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	13.0% (174)	20.3% (272)	31.1% (416)	24.1% (323)	11.4% (153)
To continue a family tradition	53.6% (692)	19.7% (255)	11.7% (151)	8.0% (104)	7.0% (90)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	16.5% (218)	24.2% (319)	23.8% (314)	19.7% (260)	15.7% (207)
To enhance my business opportunities	**68.4% (906)**	21.6% (286)	6.0% (79)	2.7% (36)	1.3% (17)
To continue my affiliation with the University	4.2% (56)	5.4% (73)	16.9% (227)	36.8% (494)	36.7% (492)
To receive athletic publications	9.7% (130)	19.3% (258)	33.8% (452)	26.4% (354)	10.8% (145)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	30.2% (398)	15.6% (205)	17.4% (229)	19.0% (250)	17.8% (234)
To receive invitations to special events	18.6% (248)	20.9% (278)	29.5% (392)	21.5% (286)	9.5% (126)
To receive XXXX-branded items	27.5% (364)	30.2% (399)	25.0% (330)	11.9% (157)	5.4% (72)

In order to further analyze whether the reasons for giving differed at each institution, a Principle Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted. As previously stated, a PCA is administered to demonstrate similarities and differences in data. In the case of this study, the PCA provided statistical groupings that could be compared the pre-determined theoretical groupings established prior to statistical analysis. All twenty-one motives were analyzed against five components; representing the initial groupings established by theoretical research. Following the completion of the PCA, groupings were formed based on several criteria. First, any motives that loaded at .60 or higher was considered to be significant and would remain in that component. Secondly, any motives that were loaded at .60 or higher, but had a secondary loading of at least .40 were removed for the purpose of further statistical analysis. Another criterion included the removal of any motives that did not have a loading of (.60) Finally, any motives that loaded within a reasonable proximity to .60, were left up to the discretion of the researcher as to whether they would be included in a given component. The output for the PCA can be found in Table 10. The motives are identified by their original theoretical groupings. The identifiers are as follows: social proofing motive (SPM), direct benefit – seating (DBS), reciprocal motive (RM), altruistic motive (AM) and direct benefit (DB).

Table 10. Principle Component Analysis

Motive	1	2	3	4	5
SPM – to be a member of the fundraising entity	.216	.171	**.658**	.247	-.047
DBS – to obtain priority seating for football	.068	**.742**	.394	-.101	-.146
DBS – to obtain priority seating for basketball	.241	**.563**	-.279	.201	.133
AM – to provide educational opportunities	**.594**	-.187	.169	.194	.233
RM – to improve the quality of the athletic program	**.733**	-.028	.330	.021	.109
RM – to improve the quality of the FB program	**.609**	.314	.425	-.122	-.057
RM – to improve the quality of the MBB program	**.759**	.227	.035	.065	.002
RM – to improve the quality of the WBB program	**.792**	.062	-.026	.160	.080
RM – to improve the quality of the olympic sports program	**.730**	.026	-.014	.127	.161
AM – to repay past beneifts received from sports in general	.155	-.146	.050	.091	**.675**
SPM – to join with friends and colleagues in supporting athletics	.121	.137	**.619**	.136	.347
RM – to support the efforts of a coach or administrator	.181	.078	-.006	.117	**.678**
DB – to receive athletic publications	.164	.001	.180	**.776**	.068
DB – to receive priority parking for athletic events	.031	**.777**	.152	.165	.057
DB – to receive invitations to special events	.141	.457	.056	**.674**	.151
DB – to receive branded items (lapel pin, auto decals, etc.)	.124	.298	.172	**.716**	.100

The purpose of the PCA was to group data based on its similarities and differences. After applying the previously established criteria, new groupings were established for the purpose of further statistical analysis. Table 11 illustrates the new groupings as a result of the PCA along with new and/or revised grouping names.

Table 11. Statistical Groupings

Component	Motive
1 - (Reciprocal Motives)	To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes (AM) To improve the quality of the Athletic program (RM) To improve the quality of the Football program (RM) To improve the quality of the Men's Basketball program (RM) To improve the quality of the Women's Basketball program (RM) To improve the quality of the Olympic Sports program (RM)
2 (Direct Benefits – Game day)	To obtain priority seating for Football (DBS) To obtain priority seating for Basketball (DBS) To obtain priority parking for athletic events (DB)
3 (Social Proofing)	To be a member of the fundraising entity (SPM) To join with friend and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics (SPM)
4 (Direct Benefits)	To receive athletic publications (DB) To receive invitations to special events (DB) To receive XXXX-branded items (DB)
5 (Altruistic Motives)	To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general (AM) To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator (RM)

The groupings formed by the PCA were very similar to the groupings established through theoretical considerations. Many of the reciprocal motives remained grouped, with the addition of "provide educational opportunities for student-athletes." This motive was a logical reciprocal motive fit. In this case a donor is giving in hopes that a student-athlete takes advantage of an opportunity and obtains a quality education or perhaps performs well athletically. Component 2 once again kept the two direct benefits – seating motives together, but added "to obtain priority parking for athletic events." Once again, this

is a logical addition as more often than not the ability to obtain priority parking from fundraising entities is tied into a season ticket purchase. Component 3 logically consisted of two of the social proofing motives, based on theory and previous research. The fourth component loaded three of the direct benefits together. This grouping supported by the thought that they are all benefits to contributing that are somewhat tangible, but not tied into giving for the purpose of obtaining tickets to athletic events. Finally, Component 5 grouped together an altruistic and reciprocal motive. The motives were not grouped together initially; however it is not unrealistic to have the two motives together. Both motives suggest someone is altruistically contributing as a former student-athlete, in which case both motives fit that description.

Further Statistical Analysis

In order to determine if motives differed between the three participating schools, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted. The ANOVA compared all three schools with each component or motive grouping. The mean score for the motives that are compiled within each component was used as the dependent variable and measured against each of the participating schools. The first grouping that was tested was "reciprocal motives." The results show there is a significant difference in reciprocal motives between all three schools ($df = 2$, $F = 32.042$, $p = < .0005$). After running a Tukey HSD post hoc test, it was determined that School A and School B were significantly different ($p = .002$), as were School A and School C ($p = < .0005$). School B and School C were found to be significantly different ($p = < .0005$).

The second grouping tested was "Direct Benefits – Game day ($df = 2$, $f = 199.284$, $p=<.0005$). After running a Tukey HSD post hoc test it was determined that School

A was significantly different than School B (p=.042), as was School A compared with School C (p=<.0005). School B also demonstrated a significant difference with School C (p=<.0005)

An ANOVA on the third grouping of motives determined there was a significant difference (df = 2, f = 371.394, p =< .005), while there was not a significant difference between School A and School B (p = .182). There was a significant difference between School A and School C (p = < .005), as well as School B and School C (p = < .005).

The "Direct Benefits" grouping demonstrated a significant difference (df = 2, f = 47.402, p = , .0005). Again, while there was not a significant difference between School B and School C (p = .742), both School A and School B, as well as School A and School C, were significantly different, as both had a p value of < .005.

The "altruistic motives" grouping demonstrated significant differences (df = 2, f = 176.573, p = < .0005) between School A and School C (p = < .005), as well as School B and School C (p = < .005).

Research Question #2

- Is there a significant difference between the motives for giving to the annual fund by alumni and non-alumni?

Based on the data, the cumulative responses from each school were further analyzed on respondent's alumni status. At School A the most important motive to alumni (based on the highest number of respondents in the "very important" category) was the desire to "improve the quality of the athletic program." The most important motive amongst non-alumni was "providing educational opportunities for student-athletes." The least important expressed motive for both alumni and non-alumni was "enhancing business opportunities."

At School B the most important motive to alumni was “improving the quality of the football program.” The most important motive for non-alumni was giving “to obtain priority seating for football.” Once again the least important motivating factor for both alumni and non-alumni was “enhancing business opportunities.” Finally at School C, the most important motive for alumni and non-alumni was “providing educational opportunities for student-athletes.” Similar to the other institutions, “enhancing business opportunities” was the least important motive for giving for both alumni and non-alumni. Tables 12-17 demonstrate the frequencies of each response for both alumni and non-alumni at each institution, the items in bold were the most and least motive at each institution.

Table 12. Motives Breakdown (School A – Alumni)

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	2.5% (34)	7.7% (104)	22.1% (298)	42.3% (572)	25.4% (343)
To obtain priority seating for football	10.7% (144)	13.6% (184)	14.7% (199)	28.0% (378)	33.0% (446)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	23.6% (314)	20.8% (278)	13.8% (184)	19.2% (255)	22.6% (301)
To promote the image of the University	1.7% (23)	4.2% (57)	19.4% (261)	40.9% (551)	33.8% (455)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	0.5% (7)	3.0% (40)	16.1% (217)	40.7% (550)	39.8% (538)
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	0.6% (8)	1.8% (24)	14.4% (195)	42.8% (578)	**40.4% (545)**
To improve the quality of the football program	1.9% (26)	4.8% (64)	19.4% (261)	39.0% (525)	34.9% (469)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	2.2% (30)	5.9% (79)	21.6% (290)	40.1% (537)	30.1% (404)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	6.9% (92)	14.4% (193)	31.0% (415)	31.5% (422)	16.3% (218)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	5.8% (78)	14.4% (193)	32.0% (428)	31.8% (426)	16.0% (214)
To gain a tax deduction	17.2% (232)	30.6% (413)	27.5% (371)	17.3% (234)	7.5% (101)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	35.6% (476)	28.6% (382)	18.1% (242)	11.9% (159)	5.9% (79)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	7.3% (99)	12.3% (166)	30.5% (411)	34.3% (463)	15.6% (210)
To continue a family tradition	51.3% (687)	18.0% (241)	11.7% (156)	12.6% (169)	6.4% (86)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	39.0% (524)	24.7% (332)	20.5% (275)	11.3% (152)	4.4% (59)
To enhance my business opportunities	**62.1% (828)**	25.7% (343)	8.4% (112)	2.9% (39)	0.8% (11)
To continue my affiliation with the University	2.2% (30)	3.3% (45)	19.2% (259)	39.1% (528)	36.1% (488)
To receive athletic publications	6.4% (86)	14.5% (195)	35.5% (479)	31.8% (429)	11.8% (159)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	23.3% (313)	18.1% (243)	21.0% (281)	20.7% (277)	16.9% (227)
To receive invitations to special events	14.0% (187)	20.4% (272)	33.2% (442)	24.4% (325)	8.0% (106)
To receive XXXX-branded items	20.1% (270)	28.8% (387)	28.6% (384)	17.0 (228)	5.5% (74)

Table 13. Motives Breakdown (School A – Non-Alumni)

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	2.4% (12)	5.7% (29)	21.0% (107)	43.2% (220)	27.7% (141)
To obtain priority seating for football	9.0% (46)	11.4% (58)	16.5% (84)	26.1% (133)	36.9% (188)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	13.2% (66)	16.0% (80)	17.2% (86)	20.2% (101)	33.5% (168)
To promote the image of the University	2.7% (14)	3.7% (19)	16.4% (84)	35.5% (182)	41.6% (213)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	1.4% (7)	2.3% (12)	13.3% (68)	32.7% (167)	**50.3% (257)**
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	0.8% (4)	2.7% (14)	10.6% (54)	38.6% (197)	47.3% (241)
To improve the quality of the football program	2.4% (12)	5.3% (27)	15.3% (78)	34.9% (179)	42.2% (215)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	2.6% (13)	3.9% (20)	15.2% (77)	35.8% (182)	42.5% (216)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	6.1% (31)	8.1% (41)	22.8% (116)	32.4% (165)	30.6% (156)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	7.1% (36)	10.6% (54)	28.3% (144)	31.2% (159)	22.8% (116)
To gain a tax deduction	27.2% (139)	28.2% (144)	25.2% (129)	13.7% (70)	5.7% (29)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	39.2% (99)	24.0% (122)	19.7% (100)	13.2% (67)	3.9% (20)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	12.5% (64)	12.1% (62)	24.2% (124)	31.4% (161)	19.7% (101)
To continue a family tradition	48.2% (242)	19.1% (96)	10.8% (54)	12.2% (61)	9.8% (49)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	33.8% (170)	22.9% (115)	18.1% (91)	14.9% (75)	10.3% (52)
To enhance my business opportunities	**61.9% (310)**	24.0% (120)	9.0% (45)	4.0% (20)	1.2% (6)
To continue my affiliation with the University	15.5% (78)	7.0% (35)	18.1% (91)	30.2% (152)	29.2% (147)
To receive athletic publications	9.3% (47)	13.8% (70)	28.0% (142)	31.3% (159)	17.7% (90)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	22.3% (113)	19.3% (98)	21.9% (111)	18.3% (93)	18.1% (92)
To receive invitations to special events	14.1% (70)	13.9% (69)	26.7% (132)	27.5% (136)	17.8% (88)
To receive XXXX-branded items	16.7% (85)	17.1% (87)	26.3% (134)	25.0% (127)	14.9% (76)

Table 14. Motives Breakdown (School B – Alumni)

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	3.0% (51)	6.9% (116)	22.9% (385)	40.0% (672)	27.1% (456)
To obtain priority seating for football	9.4% (157)	10.2% (171)	11.3% (188)	24.5% (409)	44.6% (744)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	29.2% (479)	25.3% (414)	17.3% (284)	15.0% (245)	13.2% (216)
To promote the image of the University	2.4% (40)	4.3% (73)	19.0% (319)	38.7% (652)	35.6% (599)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	3.0% (51)	6.1% (102)	24.3% (408)	37.8% (634)	28.8% (484)
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	1.5% (25)	1.7% (28)	12.4% (208)	34.0% (571)	50.4% (847)
To improve the quality of the football program	1.6% (26)	2.4% (40)	10.4% (175)	34.0% (570)	**51.6% (864)**
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	4.2% (70)	5.9% (99)	15.9% (266)	32.5% (544)	41.6% (696)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	10.2% (170)	14.9% (249)	29.7% (495)	27.6% (461)	17.6% (293)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	13.0% (218)	20.4% (342)	30.6% (512)	23.8% (399)	12.1% (202)
To gain a tax deduction	18.0% (299)	29.8% (497)	27.0% (450)	17.8% (296)	7.4% (123)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	36.9% (616)	30.6% (512)	19.3% (322)	8.9% (148)	4.4% (78)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	7.2% (120)	12.0% (202)	25.9% (439)	35.5% (595)	19.4% (325)
To continue a family tradition	42.6% (713)	19.6% (329)	15.0% (252)	13.3% (222)	9.5% (159)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	34.3% (575)	25.7% (431)	21.5% (360)	11.8% (198)	6.6% (111)
To enhance my business opportunities	**57.1% (956)**	26.8% (449)	11.1% (186)	3.9% (66)	1.0% (17)
To continue my affiliation with the University	3.6% (61)	4.9% (82)	22.1% (371)	37.4% (627)	31.9% (534)
To receive athletic publications	12.6% (211)	21.2% (355)	35.6% (597)	23.4% (393)	7.3% (122)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	14.4% (241)	12.0% (200)	17.9% (300)	30.4% (508)	25.3% (423)
To receive invitations to special events	18.8% (315)	27.5% (460)	29.6% (495)	18.4% (308)	5.8% (97)
To receive XXXX-branded items	23.5% (395)	31.9% (537)	25.9% (435)	13.9% (234)	4.8% (81)

Table 15. Motives Breakdown (School B – Non-Alumni)

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	3.6% (17)	7.6% (36)	24.5% (116)	34.2% (162)	30.2% (143)
To obtain priority seating for football	8.1% (38)	7.2% (34)	11.3% (53)	22.1% (104)	**51.3% (241)**
To obtain priority seating for basketball	27.6% (129)	22.1% (103)	16.1% (75)	14.8% (69)	19.5% (91)
To promote the image of the University	2.5% (12)	3.6% (17)	21.8% (104)	36.0% (172)	36.2% (173)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	1.5% (7)	5.7% (27)	18.9% (90)	38.8% (185)	35.2% (168)
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	0.6% (3)	2.7% (13)	13.7% (65)	34.7% (165)	48.3% (230)
To improve the quality of the football program	1.7% (8)	2.5% (12)	11.1% (53)	35.5% (170)	49.3% (236)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	6.9% (33)	7.3% (35)	19.0% (91)	29.1% (139)	37.7% (180)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	11.9% (57)	11.7% (56)	27.3% (131)	27.6% (132)	21.5% (103)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	14.0% (67)	19.7% (97)	30.8% (147)	20.5% (98)	15.1% (72)
To gain a tax deduction	20.8% (97)	30.5% (142)	25.8% (120)	15.7% (73)	7.3% (34)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	36.0% (169)	29.8% (140)	17.4% (82)	12.1% (57)	4.7% (22)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	7.2% (34)	10.9% (52)	19.2% (91)	36.2% (172)	26.5% (126)
To continue a family tradition	32.7% (154)	18.5% (87)	14.9% (70)	18.5% (87)	15.5% (73)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	32.0% (152)	22.7% (108)	22.9% (109)	14.1% (67)	8.2% (39)
To enhance my business opportunities	**54.7% (258)**	26.9% (127)	11.7% (55)	4.7% (22)	2.1% (10)
To continue my affiliation with the University	11.6% (55)	9.9% (47)	24.8% (118)	31.1% (148)	22.7% (108)
To receive athletic publications	15.0% (71)	19.9% (94)	32.3% (153)	23.3% (110)	9.5% (45)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	11.5% (55)	12.6% (60)	16.8% (80)	29.6% (141)	29.6% (141)
To receive invitations to special events	16.5% (78)	21.4% (101)	30.9% (146)	22.5% (106)	8.7% (41)
To receive XXXX-branded items	19.8% (94)	25.9% (123)	28.0% (133)	17.1 (81)	9.3% (44)

Table 16. Motives Breakdown (School C – Alumni)

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	21.2% (193)	27.5% (250)	27.8% (253)	16.0% (146)	7.5% (68)
To obtain priority seating for football	55.1% (501)	20.1% (183)	13.3% (121)	8.1% (74)	3.3% (30)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	31.6% (290)	13.2% (121)	15.1% (139)	16.3% (150)	23.8% (219)
To promote the image of the University	5.1% (47)	8.2% (75)	24.0% (220)	38.1% (349)	24.6% (225)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	1.6% (15)	2.9% (27)	15.3% (141)	36.3% (335)	**43.8% (404)**
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	1.2% (11)	1.8% (17)	13.6% (125)	43.5% (400)	39.8% (366)
To improve the quality of the football program	5.4% (48)	10.2% (91)	25.3% (226)	33.3% (297)	25.9% (231)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	4.8% (44)	6.8% (63)	21.1% (195)	38.8% (359)	28.5% (264)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	8.7% (79)	14.4% (131)	31.4% (286)	32.4% (295)	13.1% (119)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	11.6% (107)	24.6% (227)	31.3% (289)	21.3% (197)	11.2% (103)
To gain a tax deduction	31.0% (276)	27.3% (243)	27.5% (245)	10.8% (96)	3.5% (31)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	22.1% (202)	18.1% (165)	19.4% (177)	20.3% (185)	20.2% (184)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	12.6% (116)	20.5% (189)	33.4% (308)	24.6% (227)	9.0% (83)
To continue a family tradition	55.9% (501)	20.3% (182)	11.2% (100)	7.1% (64)	5.5% (49)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	17.8% (161)	27.0% (245)	24.5% (222)	17.7% (160)	13.0% (118)
To enhance my business opportunities	**70.9% (648)**	21.7% (198)	4.5% (41)	2.1% (19)	0.9% (8)
To continue my affiliation with the University	2.3% (21)	4.7% (44)	16.6% (154)	40.5% (375)	35.9% (333)
To receive athletic publications	9.3% (86)	21.1% (195)	35.0% (323)	25.6% (236)	9.0% (83)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	34.9% (316)	17.7% (160)	16.1% (146)	17.8% (161)	13.6% (123)
To receive invitations to special events	20.9% (192)	23.2% (213)	29.0% (266)	19.8% (182)	7.1% (65)
To receive XXXX-branded items	29.2% (266)	33.2% (302)	23.8% (217)	10.2% (93)	3.5% (32)

Table 17. Motives Breakdown (School C – Non-Alumni)

	Unimportant	Of little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important
To be a member of the XXXX	15.2% (61)	22.1% (89)	30.6% (123)	21.6% (87)	10.4% (42)
To obtain priority seating for football	40.1% (158)	19.3% (76)	17.8% (70)	12.4% (49)	10.4% (41)
To obtain priority seating for basketball	24.0% (98)	12.2% (50)	14.4% (59)	17.1% (70)	32.3% (132)
To promote the image of the University	6.0% (24)	8.4% (34)	22.1% (89)	36.5% (147)	27.0% (109)
To provide educational opportunities for student-athletes	2.5% (10)	1.5% (6)	13.0% (53)	30.1% (123)	**52.9% (216)**
To improve the quality of the athletic program as a whole	2.0% (8)	3.2% (13)	15.7% (64)	32.6% (133)	46.6% (190)
To improve the quality of the football program	8.1% (32)	10.7% (42)	19.0% (75)	27.9% (110)	34.3% (135)
To improve the quality of the men's basketball program	5.2% (21)	5.9% (24)	16.0% (65)	30.5% (124)	42.4% (172)
To improve the quality of the women's basketball program	7.3% (29)	9.5% (38)	23.6% (94)	30.2% (120)	29.4% (117)
To improve the quality of the Olympic sports program	16.0% (65)	20.1% (82)	25.8% (105	24.6% (100)	13.5% (55)
To gain a tax deduction	32.4% (125)	26.2% (101)	24.6% (95)	11.1% (43)	5.7% (22)
To repay past benefits I have received from sports in general	31.3% (125)	15.8% (63)	21.8% (87)	16.5% (66)	14.5% (58)
To join with friends and colleagues in supporting XXXX athletics	13.7% (56)	19.8% (81)	25.9% (106)	23.5% (96)	17.1% (70)
To continue a family tradition	47.9% (187)	18.2% (71)	13.1% (51)	10.3% (40)	10.5% (41)
To support the efforts of a particular coach or administrator	14.0% (57)	18.0% (73)	21.9% (89)	24.6% (100)	21.4% (87)
To enhance my business opportunities	**63.1% (255)**	21.0% (85)	9.4% (38)	4.2% (17)	2.2% (9)
To continue my affiliation with the University	8.6% (35)	7.1% (29)	17.4% (71)	28.4% (116)	38.6% (158)
To receive athletic publications	10.7% (44)	14.6% (60)	31.2% (128)	28.5% (117)	14.9% (61)
To receive priority parking for athletic events	19.8% (80)	10.9% (44)	20.0% (80)	21.8% (88)	27.5% (111)
To receive invitations to special events	13.3% (54)	15.5% (63)	30.8% (125)	25.4% (103)	15.0% (61)
To receive XXXX-branded items	23.4% (95)	23.6% (96)	27.3% (111)	15.8% (64)	9.9% (40)

The second research question explored whether there was a difference in motives for giving between alumni and non-alumni at each institution. Using the same groupings the mean scores of both alumni and non-alumni were compared with each component using an *Independent Samples T-Test*

The results reveal a significant difference in reciprocal motives for giving between alumni and non-alumni at School A. The *Levene's Test for Equality of Variances* suggests that there is a significant difference (p = 0.13). This is supported by the equal variances not assumed value (p = < .0005). At School B there is not a significant different in reciprocal motives for giving between alumni and non-alumni (p = .374). At School C there is not a significant difference between alumni and non-alumni. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances demonstrates there is a significant difference (p = < .0005), however the equally variances not assumed value is (p = .078).

The "direct benefits – game day" motive was found to not be significantly different between Alumni and Non-alumni at any schools: School A (p = .059), School B (p = .175) and School C (p = .722).

The "social proofing" motives demonstrated no significant difference at School A between Alumni and Non-alumni. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances demonstrates a significant difference (p = .002), however the equally variances not assumed value was (p = .884). At School B, the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances demonstrates a significant difference (p = .001), however the equally variances not assumed value is (p = .481). At School C there was a significant difference between alumni and non-alumni social proofing motives (p = .050).

The “direct benefits” motive was also significantly different between alumni and non-alumni at School A ($p = < .0005$), School B ($p = .002$) and School C ($p = < .0005$).

The “altruistic” motives between alumni and non-alumni, were not significantly different at any sampled schools: School A ($p = .153$), School B ($p = .093$) and School C ($p = .093$).

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The results from this study have several implications for the participating schools, as well as all institutions competing in intercollegiate athletics. Understanding donors' motivations at three distinctly different Division-I universities, can assist other athletic departments in better understanding their alumni and non-alumni donors. Based on this study's results, this chapter presents some conclusions, offers recommendations, and outlines possibilities for future research.

Demographic Information

Several implications arise from the demographic information collected. First, the most prominent age range at School A and School C was "56-65." This data was close to the benchmark provided in the Mahony (2003) study. The average age of the participants in his study ranged from 51.76 to 56.5 years of age. Conversely, School B had nearly 50% of its respondents fall in the "26-35" and "36-45" range. This particular data would suggest one of two things. Either School B does a tremendous job appealing to young graduates and supporters of the University or they neglect older alumni and supporters, who perhaps have a greater ability to contribute at a higher amount. It should be noted the mean contribution at School B was higher than School A, suggesting the ability to reach out to a younger demographic might be not only true, but also fiscally appropriate, for that institution.

Another result of note was the mean contributions at each of the three institutions. Only School C experienced a larger mean contribution from their alumni versus non-alumni. Mann (2007) posed the question as to whether alumni and non-alumni have the same institutional allegiance. Based on the results from School A and School B, it would appear non-alumni demonstrate greater financial allegiance. The results tabulated for mean contribution were in line with the Stinson & Howard (2007) study that also experienced higher gifts on average by non-alumni.

Significant Differences in Giving

The results demonstrate motives for giving certainly differ between the three sampled institutions. The reciprocal motives demonstrated a statistically significant difference between all three schools. Further exploring the reciprocal motives revealed the majority of the motives pertain to giving in hopes that the quality of one aspect of the athletic department or the program itself will be improved. Based on the idea that each institution has a pre-determined primary sport, the importance of giving to improve the quality of a specific sport is logical. For example, School B is primarily known for football. The response that yielded the highest number of responses at School B was indeed the motive pertaining to "improving the quality of the football program." The same deduction can be made for the direct benefits – game day motive. The results demonstrated a significant difference between all three institutions related to this component. This particular motive also has components relating to both of the major revenue generating sports. The primary sport at each institution would demonstrate a difference in giving to obtain tickets for priority seating in either of the sports. Mahony (2003) demonstrated similar results surrounding the major revenue

generating sports. His study found that priority seating and improving revenue sports were the two most important direct benefit motives.

The social-proofing component yielded a significant difference between School A and School C, as well as School B and School C. The social-proofing motives included: being a member of the fundraising entity, as well as joining friends and colleagues in supporting athletics. It is interesting to note that the significant differences were present between each of the public schools and the private school. It could be concluded that respondents at School A and School B grew up "in-state" and remain in-state after graduation. This would result in making it more important to be part of the fundraising entity and joining friends in supporting athletics. School C had the smallest discrepancy between alumni and non-alumni. Non-alumni at School C likely live in the university community, but do not have the same connection as alumni. Alumni at School C might return home after graduation and not have the same social motives for giving.

The direct benefits component demonstrated a significant difference between School A and B, as well as School A and C. Direct benefits included: invitations to special events, athletic publications and club-branded items. While this particular component, might not suggest anything of note in regards to the difference that exists, after exploring the response frequencies an explanation begins to surface. Of the three motives that encompass this grouping, "receiving athletic publications" was most important to respondents at School C. One possible explanation is that School C (a private institution) may have more out-of-state students, who become out-of-state alumni. Therefore, receiving a publication to keep them up-to-date on athletics would be important. That club-branded items rated very low at School C could be explained by its alumni, being out-of-state, do not feel a need to

demonstrate their allegiance through purchasing and wearing branded items. Likewise, non-alumni might not feel a need to boast about their support of a school, they did not attend. At School A, both "invitations to special events" and "receiving athletic publications" rated somewhat high. This might be explained by the ability to attend special events for alumni who might live in the State. School A and School B were also found to be significantly different. After reviewing the frequencies, it would appear that direct- benefits motives were simply not as valued by those at School B.

Significant differences were found between School A and School C, as well as School B and School C. The altruistic motives included: repaying past benefits received from sports in general and supporting the efforts of a particular coach or administrator. While this grouping demonstrated a statistically significant difference, it appears that neither of the motives were overly important in explaining why the respondents gave to the annual fund. School C respondents placed a slightly higher importance on both of the items. The mean response for "repaying past benefits received from sports in general" was 2.89, which indicates an answer not quite at 3, which equates to the motive being "important." The mean response score for "supporting the efforts of a particular coach or administrator" was 2.94. Once again this is close to being deemed as important. The same responses for both items at School A and School B both fell in the "of little importance" category.

Significant Differences between Alumni and Non-Alumni

The same motive groupings were measured between alumni and non-alumni, there were several significant differences at each school. Based on the "reciprocal motives" grouping there was a significant differences between alumni and non-alumni at School A. Alumni and non-alumni placed a high importance on each item in the grouping based on the

mean scores. Each of the scores was higher than 3.0, which indicated they were all in the "moderately important" category or higher. The largest disparity between alumni and non-alumni was giving to" improve the quality of the Women's basketball program," the disparity was not quite as large for Men's Basketball and Football. In each of the six components alumni recorded a higher mean than non-alumni, suggesting that while both groups support athletics and student-athletes, alumni might have a slightly higher allegiance.

In the grouping; "direct benefits – game day" there was not a significant difference between alumni and non-alumni at any school. Interestingly, respondents placed a high importance on obtaining priority seating for football or priority seating for basketball. The response distribution for obtaining priority parking was very even. The responses in this category can be explained once again by the primary sport of each school. At School B, it was very important to obtain priority seating for football. School B was deemed to be a school that has football as its primary sport. The trend was the similar to priority parking, which can be explained by the idea that at most institutions priority parking is given to those that purchase season tickets for one of the major revenue-generating sports. There was an interesting result from School C as the responses for obtaining priority seating for basketball had a high frequency in both the "unimportant" and "very important" categories, for both Alumni and Non-alumni. This is likely a result of supply of tickets. Respondents who do not receive tickets, despite supporting a school who's primary sport is basketball, would not find it important to give for that reason.

For the social-proofing grouping only School C demonstrated a significant different between alumni and non-alumni. The mean score of response for both motives within the grouping were higher for non-alumni. For example, the mean score for the motive;

"to be a member of the fundraising entity" was 2.90, whereas the score for alumni was 2.61. While both scores fall below the "moderately important" category, non-alumni expressed it was more important to be a member of the fundraising entity. Perhaps this is a case of non-alumni not feeling an allegiance to the University. By being a member of the fundraising entity, it is a way to feel part of the network of supporters for School C. The mean scores computed for the other motive ("joining friends and colleagues in supporting athletics") were also higher for non-alumni. This once again can be explained by the need for non-alumni to be part of the University family. Joining with friends and colleagues that support School C, may give non-alumni a sense of social acceptance.

The direct-benefit grouping was found to be significantly different in explaining the motives for giving between Alumni and Non-alumni at each of the three schools. For example at School C the mean score for each of the three motives that make up the component, was higher for Non-alumni as opposed to Alumni. All three motives demonstrate a certain level of loyalty or support for the institution. By attending events, displaying branded-items and keeping up-to-date with athletic publications, Non-alumni are able to deepen their connection to the University. Similar results were found at School B, as each of the motives had a higher mean score for Non-alumni, expect for "athletic publications", which recorded the same mean. School A experienced the reverse as all three motives had a higher mean score for Alumni. It was determined that at School A it is much more important to receive all of the direct benefits.

The final motive grouping was "altruistic motives." It was found that there was not a significant difference in giving for altruistic reasons for alumni versus non-alumni at any of the three schools.

Recommendations

In summarizing his study, Mahony (2003) explained donors at different institutions are unique. The results of this study support the accuracy of Mahony's statement. Statistically there were several differences between each of the participating institutions. While it is sufficient to say the schools are different, a great deal has been revealed about each of the institutions.

Of those who responded to the survey, almost 50% at School A were between 46-65 years of age. With such a high amount of donors in an older age category, the planned giving efforts of the fundraising entity should be strengthened. Conversely, the number of respondents below the age of 25 was extremely low (2.7%, 52 responses). Efforts should be increased to reach out to current students and young alumni. By creating a culture of giving back at a younger age, the fundraising entity will strengthen its future. The other result to highlight is that the motive with the highest number of responses was "to provide educational opportunities to student-athletes." Understanding that providing a special opportunity to a young man or women is so very important; this should be the focal point of the fundraising entity. Opportunities to inform School A donors of the academic accolades of its students, as well as highlighting what each donation can achieve in terms of purchasing books, tuition, and room and board should be highlighted.

School B also had significant findings that can be used to focus their fundraising efforts. As previously mentioned School B respondents were considerably younger than respondents of the other two schools. 46.5% of School B respondents fell between the ages of 26-45. This result is favorable as they have established a young donor base that can turn into long-term contributors. One important result was that 76.4% of those

that responded were alumni. This is positive in that they are giving back to the school they attended, however it can sometimes be a misconception that fundraising entities are only for alumni and current students. Promoting the idea that the entity is for all School B fans might increase non-alumni contributors. It should be noted that those non-alumni who did respond, contributed on average $600.00 more than alumni. The motive that was most important to School B respondents was “improving the quality of the football program.” The respondents and donors at School B have a vested interest in the well-being of the football program. This does not come as a surprise as School B was deemed to be a “football school.” With these results in mind the fundraising entity at School B should include the football program in its marketing efforts and engage in events that allow donors to meet the coaches, players and staff. Giving donors an opportunity to meet the aforementioned constituents gives them a sense that they have a stake in the program and their voice can be heard. Providing this chance may very well result in future contributions.

School C yielded some interesting results based on the responses collected. As previously mentioned School C had a much larger percentage of Non-alumni respond. This might suggest that as a private school it might not be financially feasible for the community and supporters to attend, but they have done a great job at marketing themselves to Non-alumni. One of the most interesting results was the large mean contribution for School C ($2625.56). This figure was considerably higher than the other two participating schools and would suggest that all supporters of the University have the ability to contribute. One of the motives of interest was that 83.4% of respondents placed a certain level of importance on improving the quality of the football program. As an institution that was deemed to be a “basketball school”, it would appear that the donors see the need for more of

a balance. A conscious effort should be made by School C to assess the needs of the football program and seek to invest a portion of the contributions towards improving the program. At most Division 1 institutions, when the two major revenue generating sports are flourishing, it assists the entire athletic program.

Future Research

There are several areas that have been revealed for future research. The thought to compare three institutions provided a solid framework that answered the question as to whether all donors contributed for the same reasons. The three institutions that participated in the study provided a small sample of the total population. Future research could be conducted with institutions that are more geographically diverse. It would be of interest to have more evidence that institutions truly are more different than they are the same. The motives studied were certainly all-encompassing and provides a solid framework for future research and could certainly be modified to fit the need of the participating schools.

The most important area for future research is studying individual institutions themselves. Better understanding the donors at any institution, enables a fundraising entity to properly set their giving levels, make revisions to the benefits they offer and most importantly better market themselves based on what donors seek.

Based on the raw data derived from this study there are areas for further exploration. For example, it would be of interest to know if motives for giving differ based on the amount a donor contributes. Understanding that the benefits a donor receives varies based on their contribution, knowing what is important at each level once again enables a fundraising entity to better establish their plan for annual giving.

Fundraising entities should look to consistently improve the level or service they provide donors. Studying donor motivations and acting on the results will allow for increased opportunities to cultivate donors and offset costs associated with major-college sport.

REFERENCES

Brown, G. (2007). Division 1 budget trends get dashboard treatment. *The NCAA News,* 44(22), pp.1-2.

Cialdini, R. (2006). Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion. New York, NY: Collins Business.

Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freemen, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (*football*) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(3), 366-375.

Covell, D. (2005). Attachment, Allegiance and a Convergent Application of Stakeholder Theory: Assessing the Impact of Winning on Athletic Donations in the Ivy League. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(3), pp. 168-176.

Daughtrey, C., & Stotlar, D. (2000). Donations: Are they affected by a football championship? *Sport Marketing Quarterly,* 9(4), pp.185-193.

Greenburg, M. (2008). College Athletics – Chasing the Big Bucks. *For the Record*, 19(2), pp.6-10.

Humphreys, B.R., & Mondello, M. (2007). Intercollegiate Athletic Success and Donations at NCAA Division 1 Institutions. *Journal of Sport Management,* 21, pp. 265-280.

Johnson, G. (2006). The Flutie Effect. *The NCAA News,* 43(16), pp. 5-6.

Mahony, D.F., Gladden, J.M., & Funk, D.C. (2003). Examining athletic donors at NCAA Division 1 institutions. *International Sports Journal,* 7(1), pp. 9-27.

Mann. T. (2007). College Fund Raising Using Theoretical Perspectives to Understand Donor Motives. *International Journal of Educational Advancement,* 7(1), pp. 35-44.

Sperber, M. (1990). College Sports, Inc. New York, NY: Henry Holt.

Smith, L. I. (2002). *A tutorial on principle component analysis*. Retrieved on March 5, 2009, from: http://www.cs.otago.ac.nz/cosc453/student_tutorials/principal_components.pdf

Staurowsky, E. J. (1996). Women and Athletic Fund Raising: Exploring the Connection Between Gender and Giving. *Journal of Sport Management,* 10, pp. 401-416.

Stinson, J.L., & Howard D.R. (2004). Scoreboards vs. Mortarboards: Major Donor Behavior and Intercollegiate Athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly,* 13(2), pp. 129-140.

Sinton, J.L. & Howard, D.R. (2007). Athletic Success and Private Giving to Athletic and Academic Programs at NCAA Institutions. *Journal of Sport Management,* 21, pp.235-264.

Wells, D.E., Southall, R.M., Stotlar, D. & Mundfrom, D.J. (2005). Factors Related to Annual Fund-Raising Contributions from Individual Donors to NCAA Division 1-A Institutions. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 6*(1), pp. 3-10.